

Ms. A. 6. 1. 28  
Concord, N. H. May 30. 1847.

My dear Sir,

I came here last evening, and have preached to-day to Mr. Tilder's Society; ~~many~~ and, having some time - not otherwise occupied, will give you a part of it, if you'll accept it. - I find, apparently, a very good Society here; I have had, I should say, somewhere from 200 to 250 hearers, and nearly the whole seemed to be hearers. The day has not been altogether favorable, though pleasanter this P. M. than in the morning. I am sorry friend T. must leave here. He has, I understand, many friends; but some few will not tolerate ~~any~~ word against the War or the Government. They wouldn't getting along with me, at all. - I was invited here for two Sundays, but shall not be able to come again. ~~Even~~ should they want me; - for why? Shall you be surprised to hear that I have accepted the office of Gen. Agt. of the Mass. Antislavery Society? Such is the fact. You see now I track along in your steps! Mind, if you please, ~~where~~ you go, if I've got to go after you! - Well! I have agreed to take the office for one year, when all parties will know whether it is best for me to continue in it. I am to begin as soon as possible, which I think may be in 2 weeks or thereabouts. This, of course, must bring my supply at Brooklyn to a close. My engagement there expired with the first of May; since which I have supplied without any definite arrangement, and with the understanding that I could cease to do so, at any time. I really wish



that Mr. Ferris were ready to step right in there; or, at farthest, in a month or two. Perhaps he will be. I saw him in New York, at the Anniversaries there, and he seemed quite disposed to go to Brooklyn, provided he could get a tolerable support. I have some fears how it will go, pecuniarily, with the Brooklyn people. John Gray's leaving cuts off something. They rely upon the A. U. A. for something; they have asked, this year, for \$125. But the Assoc<sup>n</sup>. is now \$4000. behindhand, and I fear will not respond to the Brooklyn Society's call.

I was sorry not to meet you in New York, though I did not expect it. I had a very pleasant week there. The Am<sup>n</sup>. A. S. Socy. had capital meetings. I was surprised to find how well those New York audiences bore the faithful & stern utterances there; - far, far better than <sup>those</sup> in Boston last week. The Unit<sup>n</sup>. meetings in N. Y. were pretty well, for sectarian meetings. In Boston, last week, they were shocking. I <sup>never</sup> knew them so tame, & cold. You lost nothing by not being at them. The A. U. A. public meetings had a good speech from W. H. Furness (not good enough however, for him), <sup>others</sup> ~~are~~, good also, from James F. Clarke, and the ~~rest~~ rest, pretty lifeless. The business meetings were mostly consumed in <sup>organizing</sup> ~~acting~~ under the new Act of Incorporation, in framing new By Laws, &c. &c. Dr. Dewey resigned the Presidency, - Dr. Gannett elected in his place, notwithstanding S. K. Lothrop was proposed for the office by the Nominating Committee. Friend Chas. Briggs received an unceremonious ousting, and W. S. Eliot of St. Louis elected Gent. Secretary, and a salary of \$2000. voted to him. The 15 Vice Presidents are dropped,



and one, who <sup>it</sup> is designed shall be a working man, put in their place; Stephen Fairbanks chosen. - H. P. Fairbanks, Treasurer. - E. Peabody, F. D. Huntington, Jas. W. Thompson, Isaiah Bangs, L. G. Pray, chosen Directors. - This consumed almost the whole time of the meeting for 2 days. At the close of Wednesday afternoon, I was able to get in some Resolutions, bearing on the fact that the Assoc. had had, for years past, several slaveholding Presidents. The next morning they were discussed some 3 hours, and the first, against Slavery generally, passed with only one negative vote (J. R. Sullivan), - the meeting however had thinned away very much; the other, in these words, "Therefore, Resolved, That no Slaveholder ought to be elected to any office or agency in this Association," was, on motion of S. C. Phillips, laid on the table. So the Assoc. dodged the question of Slaveholding Officers. Several men, from whom better things were to have been expected, - and even Wm. H. Furness among them - opposed its adoption, on the ground that it would be a work of supererogation; - that there was no human probability that any Slaveholder would ever be presented for office under the new Constitution. But it was well shown by Geo. W. Briggs of Plymouth, that, in the course of future Missionary operations at the South, Lowell, &c. individuals might apply for agencies, who were Slaveholders. But (what strikingly showed the fallacy of Mr. Furness's reasoning!) the Assoc. barely escaped electing a Slaveholder for their Genl. Secretary!! Yes! tell it not in Gath, nor in the Old School General Assembly, William G. Eliot of St. Louis has been a Slaveholder till very recently. When he was nominated to the Genl. Secy. ship (& this was before Mr. Furness said the above) Theo. Parker protested against the nomination,



Ms. A. 6. 1. 28  
on the ground that Mr. Eliot was a S. holder, and an Apologist for Slavery. Jas. F. Clarke said that he could not think Mr. E. was an Apologist, &c.; he had known him long, and knew him to be very averse to Slavery; as to the other matter, he stated that Mr. G. E. Sometime since, at her own very urgent request, purchased an old female slave, to save her from being taken away from St. Louis; she was to remain, work for him, &c. &c. till she had paid her price, & then go free! J. F. C. admitted (I first showed that Mr. G. E. might have done all he did in the case, to help & save the old woman, without standing for one instant in the relation of legal owner to her) that E. had not acted wisely in remaining her owner. It was stated that, for some time since, the slaveholding relation had ceased; but I can't say as it is so. Now Mr. G. E. would have been nominated, unquestionably, just the same, with the slave, or without her; and here it seemed to be brought, to our very midst, that we ought to openly avow our position on this subject, and wipe every proslavery stain from our hands.

Dr. Parkman got exceedingly angry with me, and talked to me, in Bedford Street, in a violent & insulting manner. I exposed him, as I always will do, before the Association. And he afterwards apologized - in words, but there was no heart in it. However I told him, I would not lay it up against him. But, did we live in bluff King Harry's days, Dr. Parkman would have had me at the stake before this, I verily believe.

I should be very glad of any hints from you, as to my new office. You have been one of my predecessors therein, and your experience will perhaps remind you of something useful to me to know; if so, "Candidus imperti."

On Friday afternoon last, there was a very extraordinary gathering at Theodore Parker's house. I wish you could have been there. Your name was affectionately mentioned, and regrets expressed that you were not present. Mr. P., a week or more previous, sent out notes of invitation, to various persons to attend a Council of Reformers at his house on Friday P.M. at 3 o'clock. By 4 o'clock a large company had assembled. Mr. P. stated his object to be to bring together those who might be supposed



to be interested, to discuss the general topic of Reform and  
the best measures of carrying it forward. - Let me give you the  
names of some of those present - James & Lucretia Mott, W. L. Garrison,  
Wendell Phillips, Mrs. Follen, Mrs. Chapman, R. W. Emerson, A. B. Alcott,  
Saml. G. Howe, Chas. Sumner, Caleb Stetson, Walter Channing, Wm. H.  
Channing, Jas. F. Clarke, John L. Russell, E. H. Chapin, Charles and  
John M. Spear, Elizer Wright Jr., S. E. Coes, J. P. Blanchard, Francis  
Jackson, Edmund Jackson, Edmund Quincy, Chas. F. Hovey, John W.  
Browne, <sup>and family</sup> to which add Mr. Parker, & myself, and you have about the whole.  
Mr. P. had invited others - among them, Horace Mann, who accepted the  
invitation, saying he should be happy to meet a body of "Conservative  
Reformers". This expression being mentioned, Lucretia Mott (who was  
"a bright particular star" through the meeting) asked wherein it  
differed in meaning from Radical reformers. Mrs. P. thought the  
real Conservative reformer must be radical. And so it went  
on; - from 4 till 10 P. M., with a brief interval for tea, an  
exceedingly interesting conversation was kept up. In the  
evening, it took a more practical turn than before, and  
went into <sup>the</sup> Theological ~~concerns~~ Relations of the various reforms -  
or, to say distinctly what I mean, took up the question how far  
a man's creed did, or did not, ~~of~~ influence him to give or  
withhold his influence in these reforms. E. Quincy stated broadly  
that he did not believe a man's opinions (theological) had anything  
to do with his action as a reformer; and W. L. G. agreed with him -  
I should say fully; so did W. Phillips, pretty much. Lucretia Mott,  
J. Parker, J. P. Blanchard & others took the other view. W. Alcott  
had a good deal to say, and that too which was much to the  
point; - I have never heard Mr. A. talk so well; indeed it is many  
years since I have heard him talk (with one exception.) R. W. Emerson  
was quite incomprehensible to me. Chas. Sumner & S. G. Howe, un-  
fortunately, could not stay long - having a "Prison Discipline" meeting  
to look after. Probably a second meeting will be held in the  
Autumn. If not particularly profitable, the meeting <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ very  
30 pleasant. It was good to see such a collection of "earth-quakes," & "fire-  
brands." With love to Cousin Lucretia and all yours, I am, Affectionately, J. M. Junr.



Porter, Monday May 31.  
This morning's paper  
announces the death of Dr.  
Leahy of Springfield - after  
a short illness - age given  
as 47. Warrant he older?



Rev. Samuel J. May.  
Syracuse.  
N.Y.